

## REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claim 20 has been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), on the grounds of anticipation by Barlow (US 3,872,904). Claim 20 has been amended to recite "the drive socket surface defining curved recesses between the round lobes and the flat surfaces." Support for the recitation of curved recesses with regard to the elected species directed to Figs. 3a and 3b can be found in the specification at page 7, line 10, to page 8, line 29. It is respectfully submitted that Barlow does not teach, disclose or suggest curved recesses between the round, inwardly directed lobes 27 and the flat key ways 29.

As is discussed in the specification at page 7, line 10, to page 8, line 29, the curved recesses 30 provide sufficient clearance such that the corners 44 of the hex-key driver 32 do not contact the wall 46 of the drive socket 20, with the lobes 22 contacting the flat surfaces on the hex-key driver approximately one-third of the distance across the surfaces from the corners 44 of the hex-key driver, and the recesses are curved so as to present a larger amount of material to support a hex-key driver 32 behind the three contact points between the hex-key driver and the lobes 22, in comparison to the prior art hexagonal drive socket illustrated in Figs. 1c and 1d, which corresponds to the angular recesses provided by Barlow. Barlow describes angular-shaped recess 27 at column 3, lines 39-44, and shows angular corners between rounded or flat lobes in the figures, as opposed to curved recesses between round lobes and flat surfaces, as is claimed. Barlow makes no

attempt to avoid contact between corners of the keys 18, 19 and 20 of the key driver 13 and the walls of the drive socket, and were Barlow to be modified to include wider keys, the angled corners of the drive socket keways 29 would present even less material to support the key driver. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 20-23 are novel and inventive over Barlow, and that the rejection of Claims 20-23 on the grounds of anticipation by Barlow should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Allen in view of Anderson. Allen was cited as disclosing a fastener with a hexagonal recess, but the Examiner acknowledged that Allen does not disclose rounded lobes. Anderson was cited as disclosing inwardly directed rounded lobes 34. However, it is respectfully submitted that Allen and Anderson do not teach, disclose or suggest curved recesses between round, inwardly directed lobes and flat portions.

As is discussed above, the curved recesses 30 provide sufficient clearance such that the corners 44 of the hex-key driver 32 do not contact the wall 46 of the drive socket 20, and the recesses are curved so as to present a larger amount of material to support a hex-key driver 32 behind the three contact points between the hex-key driver and the lobes 22, in comparison to the prior art hexagonal drive socket illustrated in Figs. 1c and 1d, which corresponds to the angular hexagonal recesses provided by Allen, and the angular hexagonal corners provided in Anderson. Anderson describes the flat surfaces 28-33 as forming a hexagonal receiving space at column 3, lines 60-62, and shows angular corners between the flat surfaces in the figures, as opposed to curved recesses between round lobes and flat surfaces, as is claimed. Allen and Anderson make no

attempt to avoid contact between corners of the key driver and the walls of the drive socket, and in Fig. 6, Anderson shows corners of the driver contacting the walls of the drive socket. Were Allen or Anderson to be modified to include further recessed corners to avoid contact with the driver, the angled corners of the drive socket would present even less material to support the key driver. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 20-23 are novel and inventive over Allen and Anderson, taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 20-23 on the grounds of obviousness from Allen in view of Anderson should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul  
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw  
Encls.:  
Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201